



**Punch List for Restoration of Sedimentation Basin WGS**



**Stephen Tyahla** to: jwhelan1

06/28/2011 09:43 AM

Cc: alec.wong, Bret Moxley, lene.ichinotsubo, Steve Armann,  
steven.chang, stuart.yamada

Bcc: Wendy Wiltse, Andrew Helmlinger, Carmen Santos, David Wampler

From: Stephen Tyahla/R9/USEPA/US

To: jwhelan1@wm.com

Cc: alec.wong@doh.hawaii.gov, Bret Moxley/R9/USEPA/US@EPA,  
lene.ichinotsubo@doh.hawaii.gov, Steve Armann/R9/USEPA/US@EPA,  
steven.chang@doh.hawaii.gov, stuart.yamada@doh.hawaii.gov

Bcc: Wendy Wiltse/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Andrew Helmlinger/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Carmen  
Santos/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, David Wampler/R9/USEPA/US@EPA

Joe,

As promised in my message below, attached please find a punch list of items that need to be addressed in order for your restoration of the sedimentation basin to be considered complete for satisfying the requirements of the January 2011 consent agreement between WMH and EPA. Request that these items be addressed and completed in time for the work to be documented in your forthcoming Final Report that is due on 14 August 2011. Please contact me if you have any questions on the punch list or wish to arrange a call to discuss them.

As a general point of clarification, EPA's 4 March 2011 approval of your Work Plan for restoration of the sedimentation basin (i.e., GEI Consultants' Work Plan of 21 February 2011) on which the restoration was based should not be construed as EPA's approval of the adequacy of the original sedimentation basin design. EPA approved the Work Plan for the purpose of implementing the consent agreement which requires WMH to restore the sediment basin to its intended capacity and function. Approval and implementation of the Work Plan anticipated in the consent agreement is not a determination of the sufficiency of the original design capacity and function.

Stephen F. Tyahla, P.E., CHMM  
Project Manager, RCRA Corrective Action Office  
Waste Management Division  
U.S. EPA Region IX  
75 Hawthorne Street (WST-5)  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Ph. 415.972.3466 / Fax 415.947.3533  
tyahla.stephen@epa.gov

[This email, including any attachments, may contain non-public, privileged and/or confidential information solely intended to be conveyed to the designated recipient(s). If you receive this email and are not an intended recipient, please delete this email and its attachments immediately. The unauthorized use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this email and its attachments is strictly prohibited by law.]



2011-06-28\_EPA\_Punchlist\_Sed\_Basin\_Restore.pdf

Stephen Tyahla

Joe, Concur with your request to cease submitti...

06/22/2011 04:28:47 PM

From: Stephen Tyahla/R9/USEPA/US

To: "Whelan, Joseph" <JWhelan1@wm.com>

Cc: lene.ichinotsubo@doh.hawaii.gov, steven.chang@doh.hawaii.gov, alec.wong@doh.hawaii.gov,  
stuart.yamada@doh.hawaii.gov, Steve Armann/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Bret  
Moxley/R9/USEPA/US@EPA

Date: 06/22/2011 04:28 PM  
Subject: Re: Request to cease submission of weekly progress reports - WGS�

---

Joe,

Concur with your request to cease submitting Progress Reports.  
While we concur that you have substantially completed the sedimentation basin restoration work, we are gathering what I'll term a punch list of items for you to address. I'm still awaiting some input so am unable to forward that punch list to you at this time, but should be able to within the next few business days.

Concur that the Final Report, per paragraph 25 of the Order, shall be due on or before 14 August.

Stephen F. Tyahla, P.E., CHMM  
Project Manager, RCRA Corrective Action Office  
Waste Management Division  
U.S. EPA Region IX  
75 Hawthorne Street (WST-5)  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Ph. 415.972.3466 / Fax 415.947.3533  
tyahla.stephen@epa.gov

[This email, including any attachments, may contain non-public, privileged and/or confidential information solely intended to be conveyed to the designated recipient(s). If you receive this email and are not an intended recipient, please delete this email and its attachments immediately. The unauthorized use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this email and its attachments is strictly prohibited by law.]

"Whelan, Joseph"	Hello Steve,	The most recent progress repo...	06/22/2011 12:37:37 PM
------------------	--------------	----------------------------------	------------------------

From: "Whelan, Joseph" <JWhelan1@wm.com>  
To: Stephen Tyahla/R9/USEPA/US@EPA  
Date: 06/22/2011 12:37 PM  
Subject: Request to cease submission of weekly progress reports - WGS�

---

Hello Steve,

The most recent progress report noted that all items under the AOC task list are now complete, and we are working on the final documentation report. Waste Management is requesting EPA approval to cease the submission of the weekly progress reports. The only item that is still uncompleted is the final 50 feet of the box culvert, which is not part of the AOC requirements. Since the report documenting completion of the sedimentation basin retrofit was submitted on June 15<sup>th</sup>, and the AOC requires submission of the final report within 60 days, WMH believes the final report is due on August 14, 2010. Please also acknowledge that this date is correct. Thank you.

Best regards,

Joe

*Joe Whelan*

General Manager  
Waste Management of Hawaii  
808-668-2985, ext. 15 Office  
808-668-1366 Fax  
808-479-4610 Mobile

*Waste Management's landfills provide over 17,000 acres of protected land for wildlife habitats and 15 landfills are certified by the Wildlife Habitat Council.*

---

**Waste Management recycles enough paper every year to save 41 million trees.  
Please recycle any printed emails.**

“Punch List” for Restoration of Sedimentation Basin at Waimanalo Gulch Sanitary Landfill  
(paragraph 19.h. of the January 2011 AOC between WMH and EPA)

Prepared by EPA Region 9, 28 June 2011

This punch list was prepared based EPA’s site inspection of 9 June 2011 and AECOM’s 15 June 2011 letter report Subject: "Sedimentation Basin Restoration Observation Report, Waimanalo Gulch Sanitary Landfill, Kapolei, HI" (“AECOM’s report”)

- 1) In the northern basin, the riprap energy dissipater at the 18- and 24-inch diameter storm water outfall pipes appears to still be in poor condition, not very expansive (particularly by the 18-inch pipe), with many soil fines still downstream of the outfalls (Photo 28 of AECOM’s report).
- 2) The access ramps/roads built to perform the restoration need to be stabilized by either vegetation or gravel and compaction (Photo 11 of AECOM’s report).
- 3) The interior side slopes of both the northern and southern basins need to be re-vegetated for erosion control consistent with Note 1 on Drawing C-11 of the GEI 21 February 2011 Work Plan which states “Contractor shall hydro-seed all exposed slopes of the top and interior berms of the detention pond after construction operations.”
- 4) The Work Plan specified the removal of sediment and debris from the northern basin to restore the basin floor to its design elevation of 65.0 feet MSL and in Section 2.2 of AECOM’s report it is reported that this was achieved. However, visual observation by EPA staff raised the concern that the floor of the northern basin near the upstream (northern) side of the 4-feet high interior berm might have been excavated to a greater depth thus increasing the risk of undermining the interior berm. Please revisit this part of the floor excavation and backfill and compact as necessary to prevent undermining of the interior berm. Address this item in coordination with Item 5.
- 5) Based on EPA staff’s observations and Photos 31 and 32 of AECOM’s report, it appears the removal of sediment and inspection/repair of riprap armoring the interior berm might not have been thoroughly completed. Please fully uncover, inspect and repair any damaged or missing riprap on the interior berm per the GEI Work Plan. Additionally, from what was observable, the detention pond’s interior berm dimensions do not appear to coincide with those shown in Detail 2 on Drawing C-11; please restore accordingly.
- 6) In performing the restoration 4-inch diameter perforated HDPE pipe was used in the subdrain rather than the 6-inch noted in the design drawings because the existing (“as-built condition”) was found to be 4-inch pipe. Please provide either an engineering analysis that confirms this change in pipe size is adequate to conform to the original design basis, or replace the 4-inch diameter pipe with the 6-inch size included in the approved Work Plan.